

2nd March 1926]

*Government Pleaders and Public Prosecutors.*

1496 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) in which of the districts Government after enquiry have found that the combination of the functions of Government Pleader and Public Prosecutor in one man is bad in the interests of expeditious and efficient discharge of both the functions;

(b) whether duly qualified men though not senior pleaders cannot be found for either of the posts in such districts;

(c) whether Government have ever considered the scheme of Deputy or Assistant (stipendiary or honorary) Government Pleaders or Public Prosecutors to relieve heavily worked Government Pleaders and Public Prosecutors, and if so, what their decision is;

(d) how the cases in which the Government are concerned are conducted in District Munsif's and Sub-Judge's Courts;

(e) whether District Government Pleaders are engaged for that purpose and whether their services are generally available thereto; and

(f) whether Government have ever considered the scheme of appointing Honorary Government Pleaders for such courts?

A.—(a) & (b) On the representation of the District Magistrate and the District Judge the appointments of Government Pleader and Public Prosecutor have been separated in the districts of Chingleput, Salem and Trichinopoly.

(c) & (f) In districts where assistant sessions courts or additional sessions courts are established additional Public Prosecutors are appointed to give relief to Government Pleaders and Public Prosecutors.

(d) & (e) A Government Pleader is usually appointed for each sessions division and he has ordinarily to appear for Government in all civil cases in which they are interested. The Collector has power, whenever necessary, to engage private pleaders to conduct cases on behalf of Government and to sanction fees subject to certain prescribed limits.

**Irrigation.**

*Digging of an irrigation channel from the Peri eri of Eraiyur village.*

1497 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the ryots of Melapunjai village, in Tiruvannamalai taluk, North Arcot district, have petitioned the Collector of North Arcot in 1924 to complete the digging of an irrigation channel, sanctioned, to their tank, from the Peri eri of Eraiyur village;

(b) whether it is a fact that they were asked by the Superintending Engineer, after preparing the plans and estimates for the same, to dig a trial channel of about 100 feet, at their own cost;

[2nd March 1926]

(c) whether the ryots dug the same and also the channel, as per estimates, for about 3,000 feet, at a cost of Rs. 6,000, paying the same out of their own pockets; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Government did not as yet take up the work and whether the channel has consequently 'filled up'?

A.—The Government have no information but have asked the Chief Engineer to furnish it.

*Proposed dam across the jungle stream near Seshanchavadi village.*

1498 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the ryots of Muthampatti and Kattu-veppilapatti, in Salem taluk, applied to Government some time back for putting up a dam across the jungle stream near the Seshanchavadi village and to open canals for irrigating the said villages and whether the matter was investigated by Government;

(b) whether any further action has been taken in the matter by Government and in what stage the matter is; and

(c) if the scheme has been abandoned the reasons therefor?

A.—The Government have no information.

*Construction of a reservoir near Melarasambut village.*

1499 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether there are any proposals before Government to construct a reservoir by joining the two ridges of two ranges of hills to the south of Melarasambut village in Vellore taluk (North Arcot)?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

## Land Revenue.

*A memorial from some inamdars of Kasimkota.*

1500 Q.—Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a memorial from some inamdars of Kasimkota, Anakapalle taluk, Vizagapatam district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the resumption order of the Ummadi Masjid inams according to the B.P. No. 1403 of 13th April 1897 was applied also to Phoktu or Pure Masjid inams of the memorialists, and that they were resumed together with the Ummadi Masjid inams;

(c) what the nature of the tenure of these Phoktu inams was when they were resumed, and whether they were considered as service inams and if so, on what grounds;

(d) assuming that these Phoktu inams were intended as service inams, whether the Government was justified in asking the inamdars to quit their lands wholesale;